

Remarks

Claims 1-19 are presently pending. Claims 1-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Reconsideration and continued examination is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 recites, among other limitations, “processing a first subset of the encoded symbols to identify a second subset of the encoded symbols, where each encoded symbol in the second subset uses a common coding context, wherein the coding context indicates a probability for a plurality of possible symbols”. Claim 7 recites, among other limitations, “processing a first subset of the symbols to identify a second subset of the symbols, where each symbol in the second subset uses a common coding context, wherein said coding context indicates a probability for a plurality of possible symbols”.

Examiner has indicated that in Yoshimura “the use of binary code is the common context used to process the encoded symbols”, Office Action at 3. “Yoshimura does not specifically disclose wherein the coding context is indicates a probability of possible symbols. However, Hata teaches the coding context is indicates the probability of possible symbols”. “Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Hata’s teachings into Yoshimura’s invention for efficiently encoding video data so as to permit efficient decoding and displaying of image data at the output”.

Assignee respectfully traverses the rejection because even if one were “to combine Hata’s teachings into Yoshimura’s invention”, the combination would not teach “processing a first subset of the encoded symbols to identify a second subset of the encoded symbols, where each encoded symbol in the second subset uses a common coding context”. Since Examiner has indicated that Yoshimura discloses “the use of binary code is the common context used to process the encoded symbols”, if Yoshimura was modified with Hata’s teachings, Yoshimura would not teach “processing a first subset of the encoded symbols to identify a second subset of the encoded symbols, where each encoded symbol in the second subset uses a common coding context, wherein the coding context indicates a probability for a plurality of possible symbols”.

Even if Yoshimura teaches “processing a first subset of the encoded symbols to identify a second subset of the encoded symbols”, where “the use of binary code is the common context”, neither Yoshimura or Hata teach any way of “processing a first subset

of the encoded symbols to identify a second subset of the encoded symbols” where “the coding context indicates a probability for a plurality of possible symbols”.

Accordingly, Assignee respectfully traverses the rejection to claims 1 and 7, as well as to dependent claims 2-6, and 8-19.

Additionally, claims 17-19 are added and allowable at least because Yoshimura and Hata do not teach “determining a probability for the most likely symbol; and determining a probability for the less likely symbol”, do not teach “establishing a boundary value based on the probability for the most likely symbol and the less likely symbol” and do not teach “calculating a code value from the stream of data; and determining whether to select the most likely symbol or the less likely symbol based on a comparison of the code value with the boundary value”.

Conclusion

For at least the foregoing reasons, each of the pending claims are in a condition for allowance. Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this case to issuance. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees for actions requested herein to account no. 13-0017.

Respectfully Submitted



Mirut Dalal
Attorney for Assignee
Reg. No. 44,052

January 31, 2008

McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd.
500 West Madison – Suite 3400
Chicago, IL 60661

Phone (312) 775-8000
FAX (312) 775-8100